UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,404	05/08/2001	Gregory C. Schohn	042933/274317	1878

826   7590   12/05/2008
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/851,404	SCHOHN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 October 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14,16,17,19-43 and 45-57</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14,16,17,19-43 and 45-57</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 October 2008</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an amendment filed 10/01/2008.

Claims 1-14, 16-17, 19-43 and 45-57 are pending.

Claims 1, 36, 38, 41, 42, 53 and 56 are independent claims.

Claim 57 is a new claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-25, 29-43, 45-47 and 49-57 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyler (U.S. Patent No. 7,047,033

B2 filed 01/31/2001, issued 05/16/2006) in view of Bickmore et al. (hereinafter

Bickmore, U.S. Patent No. 6,857,102 filed 01/29/1999, issued 02/15/2005).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Wyler discloses:

➢ *A method comprising:*

  o *receiving an electronic document represented by serial data that contains*

    content of the document and defines an order in which respective portions

    of the content are to be presented on a display for viewing (at least Col. 1,

    line 54 through Col. 2, line 40; Col. 27, line 16 through Col. 28, line 50 →

    Wyler describes a method for processing information received by a

wireless device over a computer network from at least one source of
information (e.g., markup languages such as HTML, Rich Text Format,
Scripts; see Col. 11, line 38 through Col. 12, line 29), parsing at least
some of the information and employing at least some results of the
parsing to provide the information in a form suitable for display to a user
on the wireless device. Markup language sources of content, such as
HTML markup, were known by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time
of invention to typically contain markup tags which at least in part,
implicitly defined an ordering of the content. When displayed, such content
would visually appear in an order at least in part according to the tagging.
Thus, <u>Wyler</u> teaches serial data received with a defined initial ordering of
the content),

o   *analyzing the serial data of the electronic document by at least one*
    transformation module to determine an order of presentation of the
    portions of the content different from the order defined by the serial data
    (at least Col. 11, line 38 through Col. 12, line 29; Col. 14, line 59 through
    Col. 17, line 40; Col. 27, line 16 through Col. 28, line 50 → content from
    any web-site, in any initial format or layout is parsed, analyzed (filtered),
    and converted to an intermediate scripting language. The scripting
    language conversion creates objects for each of the identified components
    of the received web page and allows for easier manipulation of the
    contents. Once analyzed and converted to objects, each of the objects are

given a weight according to rules governing where the content object is located both physically on the page, and logically within the page structure. Once the content objects are weighted, they can be reconstructed, for example, into a book style document, which through various means acts to reorder or otherwise change (i.e., add or remove) the content according to the style of document that the content is being mapped into (see Col. 17, line 41 through Col. 22, line 6). One goal of converting to an intermediate scripting language, creating objects, and reconstructing a document in this way is to generate output capable of being displayed and used on devices with lesser capabilities, for example, in terms of screen size (see Col. 29, line 61 through Col. 30, line 12 particularly item b. stating, "the order in which information is displayed may be changed e.g. such that important contexts precede less important contexts.").

Thus, Wyler also teaches the limitation *the different order of presentation being adapted based upon a performance capability of a display of a target device* (e.g. screen size of wireless device; see Col. 12, lines 32-37),

o   *generating reorganization information for use in delivering the portions of the content, the reorganization information enabling presentation of the portions in the different order* (Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be

reordered according to its importance established by assigned weights.
During reconstruction, a new document is created and content is placed
according to its importance governed by weights assigned to each content
component).

Wyler fails to disclose:

○ *wherein the reorganization information includes a hyperlink to be
displayed near the beginning of a first sub-document of the portions in the
different order, the hyperlink pointing to a location of a particular portion of
the content that is not at a beginning of the order defined by the serial
data, the location being determined based on the content of the serial data
and without regard to the ordering of the portions.*

However, Bickmore discloses *wherein the reorganization information
includes a hyperlink to be displayed near the beginning of a first sub-
document of the portions in the different order, the hyperlink pointing to a
location of a particular portion of the content that is not at a beginning of the
order defined by the serial data, the location being determined based on the
content of the serial data and without regard to the ordering of the portions*
(see at least Col. 8, lines 13-40; Figure 1 → Bickmore describes a similar re-
authoring system for at least web documents that includes a plurality of
"transforms." A "section header outlining" transform generates, from an
original web page, a table of contents page comprising identified and
extracted section headers, and a series of other pages containing the content

associated with the section headers. Each section header on the table of content page comprises a hyperlink to it associated content page. <u>Bickmore</u> also describes a "First Sentence Elision" transform which performs a similar function but does not rely on identified and extracted section headers but rather identifies and extracts "First Sentences" of a given text block and creates hyperlinks of those first sentences to form a table of contents. In either case, <u>Bickmore</u> discloses the creation of a table of contents (i.e. *a first sub-page*) containing hyperlink(s) to other content; the hyperlink based on the content of the serial data (section headers or first sentences).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Bickmore</u> as both inventions are related to the reformatting of web content for devices with limited capabilities. Adding the disclosure of <u>Bickmore</u> provides the benefit of a table of contents, each entry of which is linked to its related content.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the serial data representing the electronic document is expressed in a markup language* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67 → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML), scripting languages, rich text format, etc.); (Col. 14, line 60 through Col. 16, line 34 → discusses processing that typically would occur to document components associated with a markup language (links, images, tables, etc.)).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the mark-up language comprises a hypertext markup language* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67 → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML)).

In regard to dependent Claim 7, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the hypertext markup language comprises HTML* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67 → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML)).

In regard to dependent Claim 8, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the markup language comprises PDF, postscript, SGML, PowerPoint, rich text, or unformatted text* (at least Col. 11, lines 39-67 → web source page is scanned for markup languages (e.g., HTML, WML), scripting languages, rich text format, etc.).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the content of the document includes at least one of the following: text, images, tables, frames, and headings* (at least Col. 15, line 32 through Col. 16, line 33 → describes identification of document content components including links, text, images, and tables).

In regard to dependent Claim 11, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the reorganization information includes an identification of a relative importance*
   of the respective portions of the content (at least Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17,
   line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be
   reordered according to its importance established by assigned weights During
   reconstruction, a new document is created and content is placed according to its
   importance governed by weights assigned to each content component).

In regard to dependent Claim 12, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the reorganization information includes an identification of a main block of text* (at
   least Col. 12, lines 14-30 → the system takes advantage of how a typical web
   page's contents are laid out both physically on the page and logically by content
   by a designer (in regions) to assist in determining the various parts (e.g., main
   block of text) contained in the web page and to eventually convert those
   identified components into M20 scripting).

In regard to dependent Claim 13, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the analyzing includes finding an annotation inserted in the electronic document*
   as a marker of the location of the main block of text (at least Col. 12, lines 14-30
   → the system takes advantage of how a typical web page's contents are laid out
   both physically on the page and logically by content by a designer (in regions) to
   assist in determining the various parts (e.g., main block of text) contained in the

web page and to eventually convert those identified components into M20

scripting. Content is then plugged into a template according to the region defined

for it. The defined regions act as markers or annotations indicating the various

regions of content. In this way, the system can later identify the beginnings and

endings of these regions and assign them to particular web page components

and convert those components to M20 scripting).

In regard to dependent Claim 14, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the reorganization information associates a revised order for presentation with at
    least some of the portions of content* (at least Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17 line

40 → describes how various components of a received web page are identified,

converted to M20 script objects, and then assigned weights based on physical,

logical location of the object in the page as well as its relationship to a base or

main object. All of these weights are then evaluated and go into determining what

the output document contains when constructed will look like and what it will and

won't contain).

Thus, <u>Wyler</u>, in creating a revised document for a mobile device uses the

weighting to determine the content and layout of the document displayed on the

mobile device.

In regard to dependent Claim 16, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the hyperlink is included only if the location of the hyperlink in the document is separated by at least a predetermined distance from the location to which it points* (at least Col. 32, line 23 through Col. 35, at least to line 28 → describes a method for formatting a small display to contain objects that are determined to be retained (e.g., by their importance, weight). Among these is the creation of navigational components (i.e., Navigation Bar, Link Cluster). Both of these navigational components assist the user in navigating the created web page on the mobile device (see also Figures 25-28; a Link Cluster is shown in Figure 25 "Home .... Archives", etc. The "Home" link would represent a link added to link back to the home page or top of the page which is currently not displayed in Figure 25).

In regard to dependent Claim 17, <u>Wyler</u> fails to disclose:

➢ *the reorganization information causes an automatic redirection from the first portion of the content to a later portion of the content when the document is opened for presentation by directing a user to the later portion in response to opening of the document.*

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of web design at the time of invention to have added or inserted, for example, a HTML META command of the type to the reorganization information directing the new document created for the mobile device, providing the benefit of quickly directing the

user of the mobile device to content deemed perhaps more important or critical or
timely.

In regard to dependent Claim 19, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the different order of presentation enabled by the reorganization information is*
  adapted for a display that has a more restricted performance capability than does
  the performance capability of the display for which the document was originally
  designed (at least Col. 27, lines 29-38; Figures 18A-C → describes the process
  of receiving content originally from a web site designed with a desktop user in
  mind, and processing that content to generate a revised document suitable for
  display (i.e., adapted for a display that has a more restricted performance
  capability) on a wireless telephone, which would have had a more restricted
  performance capability than would a desktop computer).

In regard to dependent Claim 20, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the more restricted display is part of a mobile phone or personal digital assistant,*
  and the display for which the document was originally designed comprises a
  desktop computer monitor (at least Col. 27, lines 29-38; Figures 18A-C →
  describes the process of receiving content originally from a web site designed
  with a desktop user in mind, and processing that content to generate a revised
  document suitable for display (i.e., adapted for a display that has a more

restricted performance capability) on a wireless telephone, which would have had

a more restricted performance capability than would a desktop computer).

In regard to dependent Claim 22, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *analyzing includes identifying one of the portions as containing main content of*

the document (at least Col. 23, line 12-18 → among the components of the

originally received web page identified is the "Body Text" or the main text object).

In regard to dependent Claim 23, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *generating includes inserting the hyperlink to point to the beginning of the main*

content portion (at least Col. 32, line 23 through Col. 35, at least to line 28 →

describes a method for formatting a small display to contain objects that are

determined to be retained (e.g., by their importance, weight). Among these is the

creation of navigational components (i.e., Navigation Bar, Link Cluster). Both of

these navigational components assist the user in navigating the created web

page on the mobile device (see also Figures 25-28; a Link Cluster is shown in

Figure 25 "Home," "Archives", etc. The "Home" link, for example, would represent

a link added to link back to the home page or top of the page which is currently

not displayed in Figure 25).

In regard to dependent Claim 24, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *generating includes moving the main content portion to near the beginning of the document* (at least Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be reordered according to its importance established by assigned weights During reconstruction, a new document is created and content is placed according to its importance governed by weights assigned to each content component. A "central content portion" would have typically been given a high weight by the system of Wrier and thus its final position in the document would have changed likely to the beginning of the document).

In regard to dependent Claim 25, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *generating includes altering the document so that the main content portion appears first when the document is presented* (at least Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be reordered according to its importance established by assigned weights During reconstruction, a new document is created and content is placed according to its importance governed by weights assigned to each content component. A "central content portion" would have typically been given a high weight by the system of Wrier and thus its final position in the document would have changed likely to the beginning of the document).

In regard to dependent Claim 29, Wyler discloses:

➢ *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should be moved relative to other portions in generating the reorganization information* (at least Col. 24, lines 15-41; Figure 12 → represents a Book format style that the content components of the originally received web page, identified and converted to objects can be organized into. For the original component objects (not filtered out) to fit within the Book format style (i.e., template), many of the original component objects are necessarily relocated/reorganized to comply with the Book format style requirements. Wyler also assures that related content remains connected (e.g., via Navigational bars, and hyperlinks which may appear in locations different from the content they're directed to).

In regard to dependent Claim 30, Wyler discloses:

➢ *the portions that should be moved comprise images or tables* (at least Col. 16, line 36 through Col. 17, line 40; Col. 17, line 44 through at least Col. 19, line 38 → content can be reordered/reorganized according to its importance established by assigned weights. Any images, tables, or any other sort of content that did not get filtered out as being irrelevant, could have been relocated/reordered in the construction of the new document where the specific content components are placed according to their importance governed by weights assigned to each content component such as images or tables).

In regard to dependent Claim 31, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➤ *analyzing includes identifying regions according to functions* (at least Col. 21, line 60 through Col. 23, line 42 → depicts numerous content types, some of which perform specific functions such as advertising, linking, etc.).

In regard to dependent Claim 32, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➤ *the functions include navigation and content* (at least Col. 23, lines 13-25 → depicts numerous content types, including body text and navigation (hyperlinks)).

In regard to dependent Claim 33, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➤ *the analyzing includes converting the document to a tree format* (Col. 31, lines12-35, Figures 28, 34-35 → depicts an example of an object tree generated by parsing the webpage of Figure 28 (original page), except for the children of element 88 (Table), which themselves form an object tree and which are not illustrated in Figure 34. The objects in the object tree are graded in step 1660, in order to assign a weight to each object in the tree. In step 1670, a decision is made by threshold-ing the weights determined in step 1660. Typically, different thresholds are used for different types of objects. For example, text objects may have a lower threshold than image objects. Generally, object types for which there is a high degree of confidence that their weights accurately reflect their importance are assigned a relatively high threshold. Conversely, object types for which there is a low degree of confidence that their weights accurately reflect

their importance are assigned a relatively low threshold to prevent important

information from being inadvertently discarded).

In regard to dependent Claim 34, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the analyzing includes blocking major regions of the document by dividing the*

major regions into respective blocks (at least Figures 2-3, and 6 → Figures 2 to 3

depict <u>Wyler's</u> invention dividing original content (Figure 2) into blocks).

In regard to dependent Claim 35, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the analyzing includes counting characters of text* (Col. 31, lines 41-55 →

describes that words are counted as a part of a "word matching" function which

in turn is a part of the determination and weighting of text objects. Words contain

characters).

In regard to independent Claim 36, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *A method, comprising:*

      ○ *receiving a request from a remote device for a portion of a document*

         represented by serial data that contains content of the document and

         defines an order in which respective portions of the content are to be

         presented on a display for viewing, and in response to the request (at

         least Col. 1, line 54 through Col. 2, line 40; Col. 27, line 16 through Col.

         28, line 50 → describes a method for processing information received by a

wireless device over a computer network from at least one source of

information (e.g., markup languages such as HTML, Rich Text Format,

Scripts; see Col. 11, line 38 through Col. 12, line 29), parsing at least

some of the information and employing at least some results of the

parsing to provide the information in a form suitable for display to a user

on the wireless device. Markup language sources of content, such as

HTML markup, were known by those of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention to typically contain markup tags which at least in part,

implicitly defined an ordering of the content. When displayed, such content

would visually appear in an order at least in part according to the tagging.

Thus, <u>Wyler</u> teaches serial data received with a defined initial ordering of

the content),

o *analyzing the serial data of the electronic document by at least one*

   transformation module to determine an order of presentation of the

   portions of the content different from the order defined by the serial data,

   the different order of presentation being adapted based upon a

   performance capability of a display of a target device (at least Col. 11, line

   38 through Col. 12, line 29; Col. 14, line 59 through Col. 17, line 40; Col.

   27, line 16 through Col. 28, line 50 → content from any web-site, in any

   initial format or layout is parsed, analyzed (filtered), and converted to an

   intermediate scripting language. The scripting language conversion

   creates objects for each of the identified components of the received web

page and allows for easier manipulation of the contents. Once analyzed

and converted to objects, each of the objects are given a weight according

to rules governing where the content object is located both physically on

the page, and logically within the page structure. Once the content objects

are weighted, they can be reconstructed, for example, into a book style

document, which through various means acts to reorder or otherwise

change (i.e., add or remove) the content according to the style of

document that the content is being mapped into (see Col. 17, line 41

through Col. 22, line 6). One goal of converting to an intermediate

scripting language, creating objects, and reconstructing a document in this

way is to generate output capable of being displayed and used on devices

with lesser capabilities, for example, in terms of screen size (see Col. 29,

line 61 through Col. 30, line 12 particularly item b. stating, "the order in

which information is displayed may be changed e.g. such that important

contexts precede less important contexts.").

Thus, <u>Wyler</u> also teaches the limitation *the different order of*

presentation being adapted based upon a performance capability of a

display of a target device (e.g. screen size of wireless device; see Col. 12,

lines 32-37)*, and*

o   *returning at least one and fewer than all of the portions of the content*

using reorganization information that enables presentation of the portions

in the different (at least Page 7, Paragraphs [0164-0167] → as part of the

conversion of the source document into M20 (intermediate) Script

Language (2nd Level), Wyler's application removes irrelevant information

(images and data i.e. advertising banners, links to unrelated issues) from

the source document (webpage)). Thus, Wyler can create a new

document that has less than the original document content-wise, and

return the document to the target device).

Wyler fails to disclose:

- *wherein the reorganization information includes a hyperlink to be*
  displayed near the beginning of a first sub-document of the portions
  in the different order, the hyperlink pointing to a location of a
  particular portion of the content that is not at a beginning of the
  order defined by the serial data, the location being determined
  based on the content of the serial data and without regard to the
  ordering of the portions.

However, Bickmore discloses *wherein the reorganization information*

includes a hyperlink to be displayed near the beginning of a first sub-

document of the portions in the different order, the hyperlink pointing to a

location of a particular portion of the content that is not at a beginning of

the order defined by the serial data, the location being determined based

on the content of the serial data and without regard to the ordering of the

portions (see at least Col. 8, lines 13-40; Figure 1 → Bickmore describes a

similar re-authoring system for at least web documents that includes a

plurality of "transforms." A "section header outlining" transform generates, from an original web page, a table of contents page comprising identified and extracted section headers, and a series of other pages containing the content associated with the section headers. Each section header on the table of content page comprises a hyperlink to it associated content page. Bickmore also describes a "First Sentence Elision" transform which performs a similar function but does not rely on identified and extracted section headers but rather identifies and extracts "First Sentences" of a given text block and creates hyperlinks of those first sentences to form a table of contents. In either case, Bickmore discloses the creation of a table of contents (i.e. *a first sub-page*) containing hyperlink(s) to other content; the hyperlink based on the content of the serial data (section headers or first sentences).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Wyler and Bickmore as both inventions are related to the reformatting of web content for devices with limited capabilities. Adding the disclosure of Bickmore provides the benefit of a table of contents, each entry of which is linked to its related content.

In regard to dependent Claim 37, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *also including receiving other requests for portions of the content of the*
  document, and in response to the requests, returning other portions of the
  content using the reorganization information (see Figures 18A-C → each of these
  figures depicts different types of mobile devices capable of requesting content.
  The requested content for each of these different devices would be processed
  and an appropriate content would be then provided to each of these devices
  constructed according to an output style chosen and what fits on the screen of
  the device).

In regard to Claim 38, Claim 38 merely recites a data structure stored on a
medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests from the
method of Claim 1. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> in view of <u>Bickmore</u> discloses every limitation of
Claim 38, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to dependent Claim 39, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *also including the content, the data being expressed as a modified version of an*
  original data structure that expressed the document (at least Col. 11, line 41
  through Col. 12, line 9 → <u>Wyler</u> generally discloses the steps of receiving an
  original web page, analyzing the web page to identify the various components,
  which would include content, converting that content to objects, determining
  which objects to keep and which ones to omit, and constructing a new document

suitable for display on a mobile device such as a phone or PDA. In doing so, a

new "data structure" in at least the form of a modified/reordered/reorganized

mobile friendly document is generated comprising at least some of the original

content).

In regard to dependent Claim 40, <u>Wyler</u> discloses:

➢ *the modified version includes annotations* (at least Col. 24, lines 53 -67 →

describes an auto detection of style selected for the output document content to

be mapped into and includes the annotation of, for example, Date and Time, user

information, etc.).

   In regard to Claim 41, Claim 41 merely recites an apparatus for carrying out the

method of Claim 1. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> in view of <u>Bickmore</u> discloses every limitation of

Claim 41, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

   In regard to Claim 42, Claim 42 merely recites an apparatus (machine) for

carrying out the method of Claim 1. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> in view of <u>Bickmore</u> discloses every

limitation of Claim 42, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

   In regard to Claims 43 and 45, Claims 43 and 45 merely recite a data structure

stored on a medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests

from the method of Claims 14 and 17, respectively. Thus, <u>Wyler</u> in view of <u>Bickmore</u>

discloses every limitation of Claims 43 and 45, as indicated in the above rejections
for Claims 14 and 17.

   In regard to Claims 46 and 47, Claims 46 and 47 merely recite a data structure
stored on a medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests
from the method of Claims 19, and 20, respectively. Thus, Wyler in view of Bickmore
discloses every limitation of Claims 46 and 47, as indicated in the above rejections
for Claims 19 and 20.

   In regard to Claims 49 and 50, Claims 49 and 50 merely recite an apparatus for
carrying out the method of Claims 19 and 20, respectively. Thus, Wyler in view of
Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claims 49 and 50, as indicated in the above
rejections for Claims 19 and 20.

   In regard to Claims 51 and 52, Claims 51, and 52 merely recite an apparatus
(machine) for carrying out the method of Claims 19, and 20, respectively. Thus,
Wyler in view of Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claims 51, and 52, as
indicated in the above rejections for Claims 19, and 20.

   In regard to Claim 53, Claim 53 merely recites an apparatus (display) for
carrying out the method of Claim 1. Thus, Wyler in view of Bickmore discloses every
limitation of Claim 53, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to Claims 54 and 55, Claims 54, and 55 merely recite an apparatus (display) for carrying out the method of Claims 19 and 20, respectively. Thus, Wyler in view of Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claims 54 and 55, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 19 and 20.

In regard to Claim 56, Claim 56 merely recites a computer program product for carrying out the method of Claim 1. Thus, Wyler in view of Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claim 56, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

In regard to dependent Claim 57, Wyler fails to disclose:

➢ *the reorganization information includes an annotation, the annotation identifying a portion of content and causing the target device to start directly at the portion of content when a user requests the electronic document.*

However, Bickmore discloses *the reorganization information includes an annotation, the annotation identifying a portion of content and causing the target device to start directly at the portion of content when a user requests the electronic document* (at least Col. 8, lines 13-40; Figure 1 ➔ Bickmore describes various "transforms" which alter an existing web document so that it can be used effectively on, for example, a PDA or cell phone-sized device with limited display, memory, etc. One transform, creates a table of contents with each entry comprising either a section title or a first sentence. These entries are then hyperlinked to their associated content. The construction of the table of content by identifying and

extracting these entries and hyperlinking each of them to their content amounts to annotations added to the original document. When any of these annotations is selected by the user of the target device, the link directs them to that portion of the content associated with that hyperlink.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of _Wyler_ and _Bickmore_ as both inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of _Bickmore_ provides the benefit of providing a table of contents with which a user can quickly navigate to a desired portion of content on a mobile device.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyler in view of Bickmore, and in further view of Raghunandan (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,689 filed 06/07/2000, issued 08/10/2004).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, _Wyler_ and _Bickmore_ fail to disclose:

➢ _the serial data representing the electronic document is expressed in an electronic mail format._

However, _Raghunandan_ discloses _the serial data representing the electronic document is expressed in an electronic mail format_ (see at least Abstract → describes a method for restructuring email messages for transmission to a plurality of recipients by providing transmission control directives and email content segment identifiers supplied by the user, parsing the said directives and email contents, expanding aliases wherever necessary and applying the said directives to

restructure the email contents and further including reordering selected identified segments identified by a user in a defined sequence prior to transmission).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Wyler, Bickmore and Raghunandan since all three inventions are related to the restructure and reorder of content in various document types. Adding the disclosure of Raghunandan provides the benefit of including among those various document types email documents.

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Wyler and Bickmore fail to disclose:

➢ *the electronic mail format includes a header and a main body.*

However, Raghunandan discloses *the electronic mail format includes a header and a main body* (at least Col. 10, lines 15-61 → clearly shows the structure of an email including header and main body).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Wyler, Bickmore and Raghunandan since all three inventions are related to the restructure and reorder of content in various document types. Adding the disclosure of Raghunandan provides the benefit of including among those various document types email documents.

In regard to dependent Claim 6, <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Bickmore</u> fail to disclose:

➤ *the analyzing includes determining the start of the main body.*

However, <u>Raghunandan</u> discloses *the analyzing includes determining the start of the main body* (at least Col. 6, lines 41-44 → the email system parses the said message to identify each segment as well as the list of recipients for each segment, as shown in block (1.2)). In doing so, <u>Raghunandan</u> would have identified the main body of the email.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of <u>Wyler</u>, <u>Bickmore</u> and <u>Raghunandan</u> since all three inventions are related to the restructure and reorder of content in various types of email documents.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyler in view of Bickmore, and in further view of Hirose et al. (hereinafter Hirose, U.S. Patent No. 6,973,619 filed 06/30/1999, issued 12/06/2005).

In regard to dependent Claim 10, both <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Bickmore</u> fail to disclose:

➤ *the different order in which the respective portions of the content are to be presented includes a two-dimensional layout.*

However, <u>Hirose</u> discloses *the different order in which the respective portions of the content are to be presented includes a two-dimensional layout* (see Figure 30 → depending on screen size 320x240 versus 240x180, <u>Hirose</u> can generate a 2-D layout (see underlying page associated with 320x240 resolution containing what

appears to be two columns, with one containing an image and another containing

text). Generally, <u>Hirose</u> can adjust depending on the amount of screen space

available on the client.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the disclosures of <u>Wyler</u>, <u>Bickmore</u> and <u>Hirose</u> as all three

inventions are related to the reformatting of web content for devices with limited

capabilities. Adding the disclosure of <u>Hirose</u> provides the benefit of changing the

layout of a page to suit the amount of screen space available.

Claims 21 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Wyler in view of Bickmore, and in further view of Ma et al. (hereinafter Ma, "A

Framework for Adaptive Content Delivery in Heterogeneous Network Environments",

Copyright 01/2000).

In regard to dependent Claim 21, <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Bickmore</u> fail to disclose:

➢ *presentation of the portions of the content comprises presenting the portions by*
   speech synthesis.

However, <u>Ma</u> discloses *presentation of the portions of the content comprises*

presenting the portions by speech synthesis (Pg. 3, Sec. 3.2 → <u>Ma</u> describes a

Modality Transform that includes speech-to-text and text-to-speech transform that

transforms content into speech for use on a mobile device).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the disclosures of <u>Wyler</u>, <u>Bickmore</u> and <u>Ma</u> as all three

inventions are related to modifying original content to be suitable for mobile devices. Adding the disclosure of <u>Ma</u> provides the benefit of converting text content to speech to assist the vision-impaired.

In regard to Claim 48, Claim 48 merely recites a data structure stored on a medium and capable of configuring a machine to respond to requests from the method of Claim 21. Thus, the combination of <u>Wyler</u>, <u>Bickmore</u> and <u>Ma</u> discloses every limitation of Claim 48, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 21.

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyler in view of Bickmore, and in further view of Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 filed 07/06/1998, issued 10/09/2001).

In regard to dependent Claim 26, both <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Bickmore</u> fail to disclose:

➢ *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be separated in generating the reorganization information.*

However, <u>Kanevsky</u> discloses *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be separated in generating the reorganization information* (at least Col. 11, lines 64-67; Col. 12, lines 1-12 → amongst the criteria for making priority decisions in order to determine what and how to display web objects is how the web objects depend from or are associated with each other).

In addition, <u>Kanevsky</u> discloses (Col. 14, lines 15-28 → that web objects that contain or point to information with the same or similar topics are combined into one set.

<u>Kanevsky</u> further discloses (see Col. 14, lines 58-67 → a semantic interpreter module that separates objects on web pages that refer to different topics and combines (unifies) objects that refer to the same or similar subjects.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of <u>Wyler</u>, <u>Bickmore</u> and <u>Kanevsky</u> as all three inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of <u>Kanevsky</u> provides the benefit of fitting the content of a web page into a variety of display types and sizes.

In regard to dependent Claim 27, both <u>Wyler</u> and <u>Bickmore</u> fail to disclose:

➢ *the portions that should not be separated include at least one of the following pairs: heading and text, image and caption, or paragraph and related paragraph.*

However, <u>Kanevsky</u> discloses the portions that should not be separated include at least one of the following pairs: heading and text, image and caption, or that paragraph and related paragraph (at least Col. 14, lines 15-57 → depicts numerous headings associated with links that direct the reader to the associated content (text)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of <u>Wyler</u>, <u>Bickmore</u> and <u>Kanevsky</u> as all three

inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of

Kanevsky provides the benefit of fitting the content of a web page into a variety of

display types and sizes.

In regard to dependent Claim 28, both Wyler and Bickmore fail to disclose:

➢ *analyzing includes identifying portions of the document that should not be moved*
   relative to other portions of the document.

   However, Kanevsky discloses *analyzing includes identifying portions of the*

document that should not be moved relative to other portions of the document (at

least Col. 15, lines 30-37 → describes a semantic interpreter module that may define

what can be deleted or moved.

   Hence, it would have also determined what could not be deleted or moved). In

addition, Kanevsky discloses (see Col. 14, lines 15-28 → that web objects that

contain or point to information with the same or similar topics are combined into one

set.

   Kanevsky further discloses (see Col. 14, lines 58-67 → a semantic interpreter

module that separates objects on web pages that refer to different topics and

combines (unifies) objects that refer to the same or similar subjects.

   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the teachings of Wyler, Bickmore and Kanevsky as all three

inventions relate to adapting content based on conditions. Adding the teaching of

Kanevsky provides the benefit of fitting the content of a web page into a variety of display types and sizes.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, 16-17, 19-43 and 45-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is (571)272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James H. Blackwell
11/30/2008

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100